

### Amendments to the Specification:

Please amend the paragraph beginning at page 3, line 1 to read as:

#### Summary of the Invention

The present invention provides [[an]] a textile article having flame resistant properties comprising a plurality of inherently flame resistant fibers formed into a fabric, and a finish on the fabric, wherein the finish imparts ~~a property selected from the group consisting of: an antimicrobial agent, a soil repellent and a fluid repellent~~ flame retardant and antimicrobial properties and a property selected from the group consisting of: a soil repellent and a fluid repellent.

Please replace the text at page 10, line 2 through page 11 Table 7 with the following:

#### EXAMPLES [[3]] 5 and 7

In Example [[3]] 5, a small-scale lab trial was conducted. The AVORA™ inherently flame resistant fabric having the properties in Table 1 was first scoured with an aqueous detergent prior to the application of chemical treatments. After thoroughly rinsing the scoured fabric, it was dried in a hot air oven.

For Example 7 the chemical treatment composition in Table [[6]] 8 was applied to the scoured AVORA™ fabric using a pad applicator. For Example 7, the compositions of Table 10 were used. The pressure of the squeeze rollers was controlled to achieve a wet pick-up of approximately 45% of the chemical treatment composition. The fabric was then dried through exposure to 375 F for 1 minute in a hot air oven. After drying, the finished fabric was tested according to standard published test protocols to assess its flame resistance properties.

The only differences between Examples 5 and 7 were the types of chemical treatments applied. The treatments for each Example are summarized in Tables 8 and 10. The results of the NFPA 701-1996 Edition flame resistance tests are also summarized in Tables 8 and 10.

Table 6:

Chemical Name	General	Treatment	Amount
---------------	---------	-----------	--------

	<b>Description</b>		
ZONYL 7040™	Fluorochemical	Fluid/Stain Repellent	30 g/400 mL mix
<b>Characteristic Tested</b>	<b>Test Method</b>	<b>Units</b>	<b>Results</b>
Flammability	NFPA 701—1996 Edition	% Weight Loss & Afterburn Time	Warp—20.9 % Afterflame < 2 sec. Passed
			Fill—27.3% Afterflame < 2 sec. Passed

Several further small-scale lab trials were then conducted. The lab procedures followed were identical to that in Example 3. The only differences between Examples 4-8 were the types of chemical treatments applied. The treatments for each Example in 4-8 are summarized in Tables 7-11. The results of the NFPA 701—1996 Edition flame resistance tests are also summarized in Tables 7-11.

#### EXAMPLE 4

Table 7:

<b>Chemical Name</b>	<b>General Description</b>	<b>Treatment</b>	<b>Amount</b>
AEM 5700™	Organosilane	Antimicrobial	4 g/400 mL mix
<b>Characteristic Tested</b>	<b>Test Method</b>	<b>Units</b>	<b>Results</b>
Flammability	NFPA 701—1996 Edition	% Weight Loss & Afterburn Time	Warp—17.9 % Afterflame < 2 sec. Passed
			Fill—22.0 % Afterflame < 2 sec. Passed

Please change the paragraph starting at page 13, line 8 to read as follows:

While not wishing to be bound by any particular theory, after summarizing the small-scale experiments in the Tables [[7-11]], it was thought that the addition of flame retardant to the chemical treatments does not harm the flame resistant properties of untreated inherently FR

fibers and may, in some cases with heavy chemical loading, assist in kinetically driving the inherent flame retardant to remain chemically bound within the polyethylene terephthalate chain of the polyester fibers. But, it is not a requirement for the present invention to require the addition of flame retardant to the desired chemical treatment in order for the treated fabric to have an equal flame resistance to the untreated inherently FR fibers. Therefore, the present invention, unlike the prior art teachings, has unexpectedly found that the addition of chemical treatments to inherently FR fibers, has substantially equal flame resistance as compared to untreated inherently FR fibers.

Please cancel page 14, line 1 through page 15, line 4

#### EXAMPLE 9

Another inherently resistant fiber, Trevira CS is similar to AVORA, the two fibers having previously been available as European and American versions of the product from the same manufacturer, which has recently been divided into two separate organizations, each selling its own inherently FR fiber.

Accordingly, Trevira CS fibers was also tested in a woven fabric having the following construction:

<u>Warp</u>		<u>Filling</u>	
Denier	165	Denier	165
Filaments	64	Filaments	64
X-section	trilobal	X-section	trilobal
Luster	bright	Luster	bright
Textured	no	Textured	no
Fiber	polyester	Fiber	polyester

Without finishing the fabric had these NFPA 701 Burn Test Results:

	<b>% Weight Loss</b>	<b>Afterburn &lt; 2 sec.</b>
<b>Warp</b> _____	9.3 %	Afterflame < 2 sec. Pass
<b>Fill</b>	10.9%	Pass

An additional sample of

Trevira CS of the same construction was finished with:

<b>Chemical Name</b>	<b>General Description</b>	<b>Treatment</b>	<b>Amount</b>
ZONYL 7040	Fluorochemical	Fluid/Stain Repellent	30 g/400 mL
AEM 5700	Organosilane	Antimicrobial	4 g/400 mL

The fabric was dried through exposure to 375° F for 1 minute in a hot air oven. The pad pressure was 6 psi and the air flow set at 100%.

The finished fabric was tested with these results:

<b>Characteristic Tested</b>	<b>Test Method</b>	<b>Units</b>	<b>Results</b>
Flammability	NFPA 701-1996 Edition	% Weight Loss & Afterburn Time	Warp—12.6 % Afterflame < 2 sec. Passed
			Fill—10.4 % Afterflame < 2 sec. Passed
Fluid Repellency	AATCC Test 22	Spray Rating	100
Presence of Antimicrobial agent	Bromo Blue Internal PFG	Pass/Fail	Pass